

©
Government of Kerala
കേരള സർക്കാർ
2012



Reg. No. രജി. നമ്പർ
KL/TV(N)/12/12-14

KERALA GAZETTE

കേരള ഗസറ്റ്

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

ആധികാരികമായി പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തുന്നത്

Vol. LVII വാല്യം 57	} THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, TUES- DAY	7th February 2012 2012 ഫെബ്രുവരി 7	No.	6
		18th Magha 1933 1933 മാഘം 18	നമ്പർ	

PART I

Notifications and Orders issued by the Government

Labour and Rehabilitation Department

Labour and Rehabilitation (A)

ORDERS

(1)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 30/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Sri M. A. Habeeb, Managing Partner, Silverstream Plastics and Chemicals Limited, Ponjassery, Ernakulam and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the Secretary, Silvertstream Plastics and Chemicals Employees Union (SPCEU), Ponjassery P.O., Ernakulam-683 547 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Ernakulam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the Charter of Demands dated 15-5-2010 submitted by the Union regarding wage revision etc. of the Employees of Silverstream Plastics and Chemicals Limited is justifiable?
2. Whether the lock out with effect from 30-10-2010 and closure with effect from 1-12-2010 by the management during the discussion before the District Labour Officer is justifiable?
3. Whether any unfair labour practices have been committed by the management against union workers?
4. What are the relief the workers are entitled to?

(2)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 34/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between 1. The Director, Tyford Tea Limited, Penta Tower, 6th Floor, Kaloar, Kochi, 2. The Senior Manager, Tyford Estate, Fairfield P.O., Ealappara, Idukki District and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the Regional Secretary, Estate Staff Union of South India, Peermade in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki, Peermade. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

- Whether the change in conditions of service of Sri Sanalkumar, Pharmacist by the management of Tyford Estate is justifiable? 2. If not, what relief the worker is entitled to get?

(3)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 35/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Nallathanni Estate, Munnar P. O., Idukki-685 612 and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the General Secretary, Workers Congress, Munnar P. O., Idukki-685 612 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki, Peermade. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

- Whether Smt. Mallika, Temporary Worker of Kallar Factory Division, Nallathanni Estate is eligible to get permanency in the Estate? 2. If yes, what relief she is entitled to?

(4)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 36/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between 1. The Managing Director, M.M.J. Plantations, Manarkadu Buildings, Pala, Kottayam, 2. The Manager, M.M.J. Plantations, Kottamala Estate, Kottamala P. O., Peermade, Idukki District and the workman of the above referred establishment Sri Rajan, Check Roll No. 1270, I Division, Kottamala, Vagamon, Idukki-685 503 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki, Peermade. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the denial of employment to Shri Rajan, CR. No. 1270, Kottamala Estate, Vagamon by the management of the Estate is justifiable? 2. If not what reliefs the workman is entitled to ?

(5)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 37/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between (1) The Secretary, Marthoma Medical Mission, Marthoma Sabha Office, Thiruvalla-689 101, (2) The Administrator, Fellowship Mission Hospital, Kumbanad, Pathanamthitta-689 547 and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by (1) The General Secretary, Pathanamthitta District Private Hospital Employees Union (CITU), Pathanamthitta, (2) Sri A. T. Thomas, Secretary, Pathanamthitta District Private Hospital Employees Union (CITU), Fellowship Mission Hospital Unit, Kumbanad, Pathanamthitta-689 547 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alappuzha. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the decision of the management of Fellowship Mission Hospital, Kumbanad to effect changes in the existing service condition including leave with wages, age of retirement/ Superannuation of employees in the establishment is justifiable?

(6)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 41/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 6th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between (1) Sri Najeem Mussaliyar, Proprietor, Najeem Cashew Industries, Onambalam (2) Sri N. Nandakumar, Managing Partner, Sastha Enterprises, Onambalam, H.O. No. XXV/2000, Ayathil P. O., Kollam-691 021 and the worker of the above referred establishment Smt. Leela, Raju Mandiram, Koduvila P. O., East Kallada, Kollam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour

Court, will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the denial of termination from service to Smt. Leela, Worker on the ground of her disability by the management of Sastha Enterprises, Onambalam is justifiable? If not what relief she is entitled to?

(7)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 43/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 6th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Publisher, Madhyamam Daily, Silver Hills, Kozhikode-673 012 and the workman of the above referred establishment Sri A. M. Ahmed Shah, Ahammediya Manzil, Naranganam North P. O., Pathanamthitta District in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Ernakulam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the termination of service of Sri A. M. Ahmed Shah, Reporter/Sub Editor with effect from 1-9-2010 by the management of Madhyamam Daily, Kozhikode is justifiable? If not what relief the worker is entitled to get?

(8)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 75/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 16th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Managing Director, Autokast Limited, Cherthala and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the General Secretary, Construction Workers Union (CITU), Autokast Union, Reg. No. 1-3/2001, S. N. Puram P. O., Cherthala in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred

by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alappuzha. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months:-

ANNEXURE

Whether the demand for permanency of five contract workers namely, Sri Muraleedharan Nair, C., Sri Krishnakumar, G., Sri Bhagavat Singh, P., Sri Anirudhan, S. and Sri Vijayakumar, N. in M/s. Autokast Limited, Cherthala is justifiable? If not, for what relief they are entitled to?

(9)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 78/2012/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 16th January 2012.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between 1. The President, PTA, Government Model Higher Secondary School for Girls, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram, 2. The Headmistress, Government Model Higher Secondary School for Girls, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the General Secretary, Thiruvananthapuram Jilla Motor and Engineers

Mazdoor Sangham, Fort, Thiruvananthapuram in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months:-

ANNEXURE

Whether the demands for enhancements of wages, other service benefits and denial of employment to the bus drivers, 1. K. Kripas, 2. P. Thankappan Nair, 3. R. Gopinathan Nair, 4. C. Sreekandan Nair and the bus conductors, 1. Sajeev Kumar, 2. S. Devarajan, 3. S. Soman, 4. K. Thankappan Asari are justifiable or not? If not what are the reliefs entitled to?

By order of the Governor,